

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, and 25 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 9, 15, 21, 22, 23, and 25 are amended herein. Claims 7, 14, and 20 are canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 8, 9, 15, 21, 22, 23, and 25 may be found in claims 7, 14, and 20 as filed originally. Reconsideration is requested based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### Response to Arguments:

The Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the consideration of their arguments. The Applicants, however, were disappointed to find that their arguments were not found to be persuasive. The Office Action asserts in the section entitled "Response to Arguments," in the first full paragraph at page 10, that:

Examiner would like to point out that has claimed the additional information could be any information not just discount coupon ticket. As indicated above Sugimoto teaches changing additional information based on the utilization frequency.

Claim 1, however, recites "changing additional information to be added to said card, based on the utilization frequency," rather than simply *changing* additional information based on the utilization frequency, as asserted in the Office Action. Sugimoto, moreover, sets conditions on the *sender*, not on the cards. In particular, as described in Sugimoto near the bottom of page 23:

To avoid this possibility at least one working example of this invention sets certain conditions on the sender regarding the number of greeting cards that can be set.

Thus, even if the conditions that may be set on a sender regarding the number of greeting cards to be sent, that are described in Sugimoto at page 23, were considered to be additional information, the conditions are still not being "added to said card," as recited in, for example, claim 1. The conditions rather, are being placed on the sender, not added to the card.

The Office Action asserts further in the section entitled "Response to Arguments," at page 10, that:

As indicated before, Stanbach teaches the advertisement provider determining the target audience, such as the target age, target sex, target income, for the advertisement same as applicants invention (see col. 12 lines 39-55).

Claim 1, to the contrary, recites "preference trends," not target age, target sex, or target income, contrary to the assertion in the Office Action. Stanbach, furthermore, does not even assert that

knowledge of a *demographic* to which a recipient belongs, such as their age, sex, or income, can be used to know the preferences of that recipient. Further consideration is requested respectfully.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103:**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, and 25. were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugimoto et al. JP 11-242714 (hereinafter "Sugimoto") in view of Stanbach, Jr. et al. (hereinafter "Stanbach"). The rejection is traversed. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

In the claimed invention, advertisement identification information for identifying non-visual advertisement information is added to the card. Then, the non-visual advertisement information specified by the advertisement identification information that was added to the card is outputted. Thus, according to the claimed invention, the addressee who has received a card can use a non-visual advertisement information, such as music, if he or she inputs the advertisement identification information attached to the card into a system of a particular shop.

Moreover, in the claimed invention, the service provider can provide various services attached to the card. For example, if the advertisement identification information were a barcode representing a new song to be released, it would be possible to provide a service for a trial listening of the new song. The final two clauses of claim 1, in particular, recite:

Advertisement identification information adding means for adding advertisement identification information for identifying non-visual advertisement information to said card; and  
advertisement information output means for outputting non-visual advertisement information specified by said advertisement identification information, based on the advertisement identification information added by said advertisement identification information adding means.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest "adding advertisement identification information for identifying non-visual advertisement information to said card," or "outputting non-visual advertisement information specified by said advertisement identification information, based on the advertisement identification information added by said advertisement identification information adding means," as recited in claim 1. The Office Action, in fact, does not even assert that either Sugimoto or Stanbach *do* teach "adding advertisement identification information for identifying non-visual advertisement information to said card," or "outputting non-visual advertisement information specified by said advertisement identification information, based on the advertisement identification information added by said advertisement identification

information adding means," as recited in claim 1. Thus, even if Sugimoto and Stanbach were combined, as proposed in the Office Action, the claimed invention would not result.

The eighth clause of claim 1 recites:

Wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the providing target for the selection.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the providing target for the selection," as recited in claim 1.

The tenth clause of claim 1 recites:

Selecting a plurality of advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "selecting a plurality of advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee," as recited in claim 1. Sugimoto, rather, pays no attention to what the preference trends of the addressee might be at all, let alone selects advertising information based upon them. In particular, as Sugimoto describes the Problem to be Solved:

To enable a new type of advertisement, which is called solicited and, by sending a receiver an electronic greeting card and automatically inputting both a sender and the receiver to lottery about a free gift selected by the sender.

Thus, in Sugimoto a free gift is selected by the *sender*, not "selecting advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee," as recited in claim 1. There may be no correlation at all between what the sender thinks the addressee might like and the actual preferences of the addressee.

Furthermore, as Sugimoto describes the Solution:

Since a sender generates an electronic greeting card, sends it and selects a free gift that can be acquired by the sender and his receiver as a team, one among plural 'courses' corresponding to each advertisement company can be picked up (S302).

Thus, in Sugimoto, the *sender* selects the free gift, not "selecting advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee," as recited in claim 1. There may be no correlation at all between what the sender thinks the providing target might like and the actual preferences of the providing target.

Furthermore, as Sugimoto also describes in the Solution:

The sender selects a free gift (S304).

Thus, in Sugimoto, the *sender* selects the free gift, not "selecting advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee," as recited in claim 1. There may be no correlation at all between what the sender thinks the addressee might like and the actual preferences of the providing target.

Furthermore, as Sugimoto also describes in the Solution:

The free gift can or can not be acquired by the sender and the receiver as the team.

Thus, in Sugimoto, since the free gift might be acquired by both the sender and the receiver, as the team, the sender's personal gift preferences will surely take precedence over whatever the sender might think the receiver might like with respect to the nature of the gift. This is to be contrasted with claim 1, which recites, "selecting advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee."

Finally, as Sugimoto also describes in the Solution:

The sender is requested to fill out a questionnaire before sending a 1st greeting card of a specific course in the process of generating an electronic greeting card (S306).

Since, in Sugimoto, the sender is filling out the questionnaire, Sugimoto is not, "selecting advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee," as recited in claim 1.

Stanbach, for its part, relies on the *demographic* groups to which a person belongs, i.e. their zip code, state, city, income, age, or sex (as shown in Table 1, at column 12, line 32) to target advertisements associated with emails, not preference trends. Knowledge of a person's demographics, such as their age or sex, is not equivalent to knowledge of their preference trends. A person may, for example, belong to several different, overlapping demographics, the members of each of which having unique preference trends.

Stanbach, furthermore, selects a set of advertisements matching the *demographic* profile of the intended recipient. In particular, as described at column 9, lines 62-66:

A demographic profile of the intended recipient is generated (or selected, as the information already exists). Next, a set of advertisements matching the demographic profile of the intended recipient is selected from a table of advertisements.

Since Stanbach is selecting advertisements based on the demographic profile of the intended

recipient, Stanbach is not, "selecting advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee," as recited in claim 1.

Stanbach, furthermore, queries *demographic* information pertaining to the intended recipient 720 to select the demographic profile snapshot best matching the intended recipient 720 when selecting an advertisement. In particular, as described at column 12, lines 43-50:

When selecting an advertisement, demographic information pertaining to the intended recipient 720 is queried to select the demographic profile snapshot best matching the intended recipient 720. If, for example, the intended recipient 720 matches a "west coast yuppie" profile, then the `daily_ads_west_coast_yuppie` snapshot can be queried for advertisements directed towards the intended recipient's more specific demographic profile.

Since, in Stanbach, demographic information pertaining to the intended recipient 720 is queried to select the demographic profile snapshot best matching the intended recipient 720 when selecting an advertisement, Stanbach is not, "selecting advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee," as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, in Stanbach, advertisements are selected to match demographics such as a target age range of 22 through 30, or a target income of greater than \$50,000, not preference trends. In particular, as described at column 12, lines 51-55:

For example, perhaps only female west coast yuppies are the target audience, the target age range is 22 through 30, and the target income is greater than \$50,000. The `daily_ads_west_coast_yuppie` snapshot is then queried for advertisements matching the target criteria.

Since, in Stanbach, advertisements are selected to match demographics such as a target age or a target income, Stanbach is not, "selecting advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee," as recited in claim 1.

The fourteenth clause of claim 1 recites:

Changing additional information to be added to said card, based on the utilization frequency counted by said utilization frequency counting means.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "changing additional information to be added to said card, based on the utilization frequency counted by said utilization frequency counting means," as recited in claim 1. Thus, even if Sugimoto and Stanbach were combined, as proposed in the Office Action, the claimed invention would not result. Claim 1 is submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2, 4, and 6 depend from claim 1 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims

2, 4, and 6 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 4, and 6 is also earnestly solicited.

Claims 8:

The eighth clause of claim 8 recites:

Wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the providing target for the selection.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the providing target for the selection," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The tenth clause of claim 8 recites:

Selecting a plurality of advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "selecting a plurality of advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The fourteenth clause of claim 8 recites:

Changing additional information to be added to said card, based on the utilization frequency counted by said utilization frequency counting means.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "changing additional information to be added to said card, based on the utilization frequency counted by said utilization frequency counting means," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The final two clauses of claim 8 recite:

Advertisement identification information adding means for adding advertisement identification information for identifying non-visual advertisement information to said card; and  
advertisement information output means for outputting non-visual advertisement information specified by said advertisement identification information, based on the advertisement identification information added by said advertisement identification information adding means.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "adding advertisement identification information for identifying non-visual advertisement information to said card," or "outputting non-visual advertisement information specified by said advertisement identification information, based on the advertisement identification information added by said advertisement identification

information adding means," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Thus, even if Sugimoto and Stanbach were combined, as proposed in the Office Action, the claimed invention would not result. Claim 8 is submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 8 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 9, 11, 12, and 13:

The thirteenth clause of claim 9 recites:

Wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the providing target for the selection.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the providing target for the selection," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The fifteenth clause of claim 9 recites:

Changing additional information to be added to said card, based on a utilization frequency of the card sending service by said card sending client.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "changing additional information to be added to said card, based on a utilization frequency of the card sending service by said card sending client," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The final clause of claim 9 recites:

Adding advertisement identification information for identifying non-visual advertisement information to said card, and outputting the non-visual advertisement information specified by said advertisement identification information, based on the added advertisement identification information.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "adding advertisement identification information for identifying non-visual advertisement information to said card, and outputting the non-visual advertisement information specified by said advertisement identification information, based on the added advertisement identification information," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Thus, even if Sugimoto and Stanbach were combined, as proposed in the Office Action, the claimed invention would not result. Claim 9 is submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 11, 12, and 13 depend from claim 9 and add further distinguishing elements.

Claims 11, 12, and 13 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11, 12, and 13 is also earnestly solicited.

Claims 15, 17, 18, and 19:

The eleventh clause of claim 15 recites,

Wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the providing target for the selection.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the providing target for the selection," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The fourteenth clause of claim 15 recites:

Changing additional information to be added to said card, based on a utilization frequency of the card sending service by said card sending client.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "changing additional information to be added to said card, based on a utilization frequency of the card sending service by said card sending client," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The final clause of claim 15 recites:

Adding advertisement identification information identifying non-visual advertisement information to said card, and outputting non-visual advertisement information specified by said advertisement identification information, based on the added advertisement identification information.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "adding advertisement identification information identifying non-visual advertisement information to said card, and outputting non-visual advertisement information specified by said advertisement identification information, based on the added advertisement identification information," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Thus, even if Sugimoto and Stanbach were combined, as proposed in the Office Action, the claimed invention would not result. Claim 15 is submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 17, 18, and 19 depend from claim 15 and add further distinguishing elements. Claims 17, 18, and 19 are thus also submitted to be allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17, 18, and 19 is also earnestly solicited.



Claim 21:

The eighth clause of claim 21 recites:

Wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the providing target for the selection.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the providing target for the selection," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The tenth clause of claim 21 recites:

Selecting a plurality of advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee input by said first preference trend input unit.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "selecting a plurality of advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee input by said first preference trend input unit," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The fourteenth clause of claim 21 recites:

Changing additional information to be added to said card, based on the utilization frequency counted by said utilization frequency counting unit.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "changing additional information to be added to said card, based on the utilization frequency counted by said utilization frequency counting unit," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The final two clauses of claim 21 recite:

Advertisement identification information adding unit for adding advertisement identification information for identifying non-visual advertisement information to said card; and  
advertisement information output unit for outputting non-visual advertisement information specified by said advertisement identification information, based on the advertisement identification information added by said advertisement identification information adding unit.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "adding advertisement identification information for identifying non-visual advertisement information to said card," or "outputting non-visual advertisement information specified by said advertisement identification information, based on the advertisement identification information added by said advertisement identification information adding unit," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Thus, even if Sugimoto and Stanbach were combined, as proposed in the Office Action, the claimed

invention would not result. Claim 21 is submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 22:

The eleventh clause of claim 22 recites:

Wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the providing target for the selection.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the providing target for the selection," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The fourteenth clause of claim 22 recites:

Changing additional information to be added to said card, based on a utilization frequency of the card sending service by said card sending client.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "changing additional information to be added to said card, based on a utilization frequency of the card sending service by said card sending client," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The final clause of claim 22 recites:

Adding advertisement identification information for identifying non-visual advertisement information to said card, and outputting the non-visual advertisement information specified by said advertisement identification information, based on the added advertisement identification information.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "adding advertisement identification information for identifying non-visual advertisement information to said card, and outputting the non-visual advertisement information specified by said advertisement identification information, based on the added advertisement identification information," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Thus, even if Sugimoto and Stanbach were combined, as proposed in the Office Action, the claimed invention would not result. Claim 22 is submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 23:

The eleventh clause of claim 23 recites:

Wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the providing target for the selection.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the providing target for the selection," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The fourteenth clause of claim 23 recites:

Changing additional information to be added to said card, based on a utilization frequency of the card sending service by said card sending client.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "changing a additional information to be added to said card, based on a utilization frequency of the card sending service by said card sending client," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The final clause of claim 23 recites:

Adding advertisement identification information identifying non-visual advertisement information to said card, and outputting non-visual advertisement information specified by said advertisement identification information, based on the added advertisement identification information.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "adding advertisement identification information identifying non-visual advertisement information to said card, and outputting non-visual advertisement information specified by said advertisement identification information, based on the added advertisement identification information," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Thus, even if Sugimoto and Stanbach were combined, as proposed in the Office Action, the claimed invention would not result. Claim 23 is submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 23 is earnestly solicited.

#### Claim 25:

The second clause of claim 25 recites:

Preliminarily determining preference trends of a providing target of the advertisement by an advertisement provider.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "preliminarily determining preference trends of a providing target of the advertisement by an advertisement provider," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The fourth clause of claim 25 recites:

Selecting by the advertisement provider a plurality of advertisement information with a providing target whose preference trends would be suitable for the preference trends of the addressee.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "selecting by the advertisement provider a plurality of advertisement information with a providing target whose preference trends would be suitable for the preference trends of the addressee," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

The final clause of claim 25 recites:

Adding advertisement identification information for identifying non-visual advertisement information to said card, and outputting the non-visual advertisement information specified by said advertisement identification information, based on the added advertisement identification information.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "adding advertisement identification information for identifying non-visual advertisement information to said card, and outputting the non-visual advertisement information specified by said advertisement identification information, based on the added advertisement identification information," as discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Thus, even if Sugimoto and Stanbach were combined, as proposed in the Office Action, the claimed invention would not result. Claim 25 is submitted to be allowable, for at least those reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 25 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, and 25:

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugimoto further in view of Stanbach and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,076,101 to Kamakura et al. (hereinafter "Kamakura"). The rejection is traversed. Reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Neither Sugimoto nor Stanbach teach, disclose, or suggest, "changing additional information to be added to said card, based on the utilization frequency counted by said utilization frequency counting means," "wherein the plurality of advertisement information is selected so as to be suitable for the preference trends of the providing target for the selection," "selecting a plurality of advertisement information suitable for the preference trends of the addressee," "adding advertisement identification information for identifying non-visual advertisement information to said card," or "outputting non-visual advertisement information specified by said advertisement identification information, based on the advertisement identification information added by said advertisement identification information adding means,"

as discussed above with respect to one or another of the rejections of claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, and 25.

Kamakura does not either, and thus cannot make up for the deficiencies of either Sugimoto or Stanbach with respect to the claimed invention. Thus, even if Sugimoto, Stanbach and Kamakura were combined, as proposed in the Office Action, the claimed invention would not result. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, and 25 is earnestly solicited.

**Conclusion:**

Accordingly, in view of the reasons given above, it is submitted that all of claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, and 25 are allowable over the cited references. If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 04/12/07

By: 

Thomas E. McKiernan  
Registration No. 37,889

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501